## References

Barbour, T. 1930. A list of Antillean reptiles and amphibians. *Zoologica* **11** (4) : 61–116.

Barbour, T. 1935. A second list of Antillean reptiles and amphibians. *Ibid.* **19** (3) : 77–141.

Barbour, T. 1937. Third list of Antillean reptiles and amphibians. *Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool.* 82 (2) : 77–166.

Boulenger, G. A. 1882. *Catalogue of the Batrachia Salientia s. Ecaudata in the collection of the British Museum.* 2nd. Ed. London, xvi + 503 pp.

Collette, B. B., D. M. Cohen and J. A. Peters. 1972. Stability in zoological nomenclature. *Science* **177** : 452–453.

Corliss, J. O. 1972. Priority and stability in zoological nomenclature: Resolution of the problem of Article 23b at the Monaco Congress. *Science* **177** : 1120.

Crombie, R. I. MS. The ecology and systematics of Jamaican hylid frogs.

Duellman, W. E. 1960. Redescription of *Hyla valancifer.* Studies of American hylid frogs. III. *Herpetologica* **16** (1) : 55–57.

Duellman, W. E. 1970. *The hylid frogs of Middle America.* Monogr. Mus. Nat. Hist., Univ. Kansas, 1, xi + 753 pp

Dunn, E. R. 1926. The frogs of Jamaica. *Proc. Boston Soc. Nat. Hist.* 38 (4) : 111–130.

Dunn, E. R. 1929. On the trail of the snorer. *Nature* **13** (2) : 110–112.

Gosse, P. H. 1851. *A naturalist's sojourn in Jamaica.* Longman's Brown, Green, and Longman's, London, v–xxvi + 508 pp.

Harlan, R. 1826. A new species of *Hyla. American Journ. Sci. Arts* **10** : 64–65.

Lynn, W. G. 1940. I. Amphibians. *In* Lynn, W. G. and C. Grant, The herpetology of Jamaica. *Bull. Inst. Jamaica, Sci. Ser., no.* 1 : 1–148 (1–60).

Lynn, W. G. and J. N. Dent. 1943. Notes on Jamaican amphibians. *Copeia* **1943** (4) : 234–242.

Mayr, E., G. G. Simpson, and E. Eisenmann. 1971. Stability in zoological nomenclature. *Science* **174** : 1041–1042.

Nieden, F. 1923. Anura I. Subordo Aglossa and Phaneroglossa, Sectio. 1, Arcifera. *Das Tierreich*, Lief. 46, Berlin, i–xxxii + 584 pp.

Panton, E. S. 1952. Our ground and tree frogs—Glimpses into their life and habits. *Nat. Hist. Notes Nat. Hist. Soc. Jamaica* **5** (53) : 87–92 + 94.

Schwartz, A. and D. C. Fowler. In press. The Anura of Jamaica: A progress report. Stud. Fauna Curaçao and other Carib. Islands.

Taylor, E. H. 1948. Two new hylid frogs from Costa Rica. *Copeia* **1948** (4) : 233–238.

Trueb, L. 1970. The evolutionary relationships of casque-headed treefrogs with co-ossified skulls (family Hylidae). *Univ. Kansas Publ., Mus. Nat. Hist.* **18** : 547–716.

Trueb, L. 1972. *Hyla crucialis* Harlan, 1826 (Amphibia) : Proposed suppression under plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 1982, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **29** (1) : 39–40.

Tyler, M. J. 1971. The phylogenetic significance of vocal sac structure in hylid frogs. *Univ. Kansas Publ., Mus. Nat. Hist.* **19** : 319–360.

## ADDENDUM TO THE PROPOSAL THAT THE GENUS NAME *TEUTHIS* LINNAEUS (PISCES) BE SUPPRESSED. Z.N.(S.) 1721

By D. J. Woodland (*Department of Zoology, University of New England, Armidale, N.S.W., 2351, Australia*)

This comment relates to proposals before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the generic name *Siganus* Forsskål, 1775 and *Teuthis* Linnaeus, 1766 (Nielsen & Klausewitz *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **25** : 16, Taylor *Bull. zool.*

*Nomencl.* **26** : 178, and Woodland *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **29** : 190). In particular it is a clarification of the status of the specimen designated by Taylor (*loc. cit.*) as lectotype of *Teuthis javus* Linnaeus, 1766 and discussed by Woodland (*loc. cit.*, para. 6).

I have now examined the said specimen from the Gronovius collection (British Museum (Nat. Hist.) Reg. No. 1853, 11. 12. 30). Wheeler (1958, *Bull. British Museum, Nat. Hist., Histological Series* **1** : 231) was correct in asserting that this specimen was not of that species generally known as *Teuthis javus* Linnaeus but of that generally known as *Siganus oramin* Bloch, 1801. In belief that the specimen was of that species described by Gronovius (1763, *Zoophylaci*) as his species no. 352, which was later adopted by Linnaeus as his *Teuthis javus* (*loc. cit.*, p. 507), Wheeler (*loc. cit.*, p. 231) nominated the specimen as "holotype" and suggested a number of nomenclatural changes. However, as I will show these changes are not necessary since the specimen does not belong to that species described and figured by Gronovius.

We may consider Gronovius' description of his species no. 352 as consisting of two parts, the verbal and the figure (*loc. cit.*, p. 113, pl. 8, fig. 4). The figure is unmistakeably of that species generally known as *Teuthis javus* Linnaeus; there is no room for confusion. On the other hand because of the use of qualitative terms most of the verbal description could apply to either the species figured or the specimen 1853. 11.12.30. However, one portion of the description does not tally with the specimen, though it does agree with the species figured. Quote, "infra oculos in utroque latere regio lata, quae squamis minutis confusanei obtecta est", i.e. below the eyes on either side a broad region covered with small scales. The scale cover on the cheeks is a distinctive characteristic of *Teuthis javus* Linnaeus. The specimen, 1853.11.12.30, has no scales on the cheeks which is typical of the species to which it belongs (although there may be a few weak scattered scales in some specimens). Furthermore, Gronovius (*loc. cit.*) describes his species as "dark liver-brownish with frequent oblongish spots on the sides, bluish-white, oriented longitudinally, towards the abdomen broader and more variegated" translated). Again this fits his illustration but not the species represented by the specimen. In addition *Teuthis javus* Linnaeus is unique amongst its family in having more than 30 scale rows between the lateral line and the bases of the anterior dorsal spines; specimen 1853.11.12.30 has 21 to 23 scale rows.

I am forced to conclude that the verbal description and figure of the Gronovius species no. 352 are of the one species, *Teuthis javus* Linnaeus as widely understood. I am also led to conclude that there is no evidence that specimen 1853.11.12.30 has contributed even in part to Gronovius' species no. 352. This is not altogether surprising for as Wheeler (*loc. cit.*, pp. 188–9) stated the British Museum did not acquire the whole Gronovius collection, and what it did acquire contained some specimens that were not described by Gronovius.

Since Linnaeus' *Teuthis javus* (*loc. cit.*, p. 507) is essentially a précis of Gronovius' species no. 352, and is in fact diagnosed by Linnaeus as a siganid by the ventral fin formula and is that species widely known as *Teuthis javus* by the description of the colour pattern (longitudinal bluish spots), it follows that the designation of specimen 1853.11.12.30 as lectotype must be considered null and void. The specimen on which Gronovius species no. 352 and hence *Teuthis javus* Linnaeus were based remains lost.

## COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED NEOTYPE OF THE GRAPTOLITE SPECIES *GRAPTOLITHUS NILSSONI* BARRANDE, 1850, Z.N.(S.) 1934

By I. Strachan (*Geology Department, University of Birmingham, Birmingham* B15 2TT, *England.*)

The purpose of the proposal by D. Palmer appears to be the stability of the use of the specific name *nilssoni* among the graptolite faunas of the Silurian so that past and present stratigraphic usage is kept as near together as possible. In this context the authorship of the name is immaterial since there are no other graptolites with the